UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,609	07/01/2003	Denise Marie Genty	AUS919990302US2	1448

35525 7590 03/11/2009

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER	
TRAN, BANGLONG	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2458	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/11/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeeiplaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/611,609	GENTY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BANGLONG TRAN	2458	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 July 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *21,23-26,28-30 and 32-41* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *21, 23-26, 28-30, 32-4* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *01 July 0203* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *07/01/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20, 22, 27 and 31 are canceled by the Preliminary Amendment.

2. Claims 21, 23-26, 28-30, and 32-41 are pending.

Specification

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract contains more than 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 21, 23 , 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 38-41 of instant application, each claim and every element of claims disclose every element of claims 1,10-13, 23, 24 of U. S. Patent No. 6675225, as such anticipate claims 1, 10-13, 23, 24 of Patent No. 6675225.

"A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or **anticipated by**, the earlier claim. In re Longi, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); In re Berg, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus)." ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Court, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims recite "transmitting means....reconfiguring means....mean for determining...mean for assigning...mean for activating.." are nonstatutory and just limited to functional descriptive material consisting of computer program per se (reciting in paragraph

[0028], By automatically changing IP addresses of the trusted hosts on the VPN via a predetermined algorithm), algorithm is a software per se, instead of being defined as including tangible embodiments (i.e., a computer readable storage medium such as memory device, ...). As such, the claims are not limited to statutory subject matter and are therefore nonstatutory.

Claim 40 is depending on claim 26, claim 29, 30 and 41 are depending on claim 28 and therefore they are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claim 26 and 28 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 21, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Hoke et al (hereinafter Hoke), U.S Patent No. 6701437 in view of Schneider et al (hereinafter Schneider), U.S Patent No. 6178505 which is included in the IDS.

10. As to claim 21, Hoke discloses a method for communicating on a network between a first data processing system and a second data processing system, the method comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

transmitting data packets on the network from the first data processing system to the second data processing system using a virtual private network (VPN) (column 8, lines 38-48; column 9, 10-12); and

automatically reconfiguring the VPN to use alternate addresses on the network for the first data processing system and the second data processing system (column 13, lines 28-49), wherein automatically reconfiguring the VPN to use alternate addresses on the network for the first data processing system and the second data processing system includes:

assigning an alternate address to the first data processing system and the second data processing system based on which of the plurality of reconfiguring algorithms (VPN unit implying Packet Processing Module 618 in Fig.6) is currently active (column 12, lines 32-36; column 13, lines 28-49).

Hoke does not disclose determining which of a plurality of reconfiguring algorithm is currently active. However Schneider discloses the feature of determining which of a plurality of reconfiguring algorithm is currently active (column 19, lines 37-42).

It would have been obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Hoke with the teaching of Schneider to have the feature of determining which of a plurality of reconfiguring algorithm is currently active. Because it would provide users the better way to send data over VPN, like cost savings and scalability, securely transmitting to ensure the authenticity, integrity and confidentiality of data; avoid traditional leased line by tapping into the geographically-distributed assess already available.

11. As to claim 26, Hoke discloses a distributed data processing system for communicating on a network, the distributed data processing system comprising:

transmitting means (Fig.6, Processor 600) for transmitting data packets on the network from a first data processing system to a second data processing system using a virtual private network (VPN) (column 8, lines 38-48; column 9, lines 10-12); and

reconfiguring means (Fig.6, Packet Processing Module 618) for automatically reconfiguring the VPN to use alternate addresses on the network for the first data processing system and the second data processing system (column 13, line 48-49), wherein the reconfiguring means includes:

means for assigning (Fig 6. Packet Processing Module 618) an alternate address to the first data processing system and the second data processing system based on which of the plurality of reconfiguring algorithms is currently active (column 12, lines 32-36; column 13, lines 28-49).

Hoke does not disclose means for determining which of a plurality of reconfiguring algorithms is currently active. However, Schneider discloses means for determining (Fig.2, Access Filter 203) which of a plurality of reconfiguring algorithms is currently active (column 19, lines 37-42).

The motivation of this claim is as same as the one of claim 21 above.

12. Claims 23, 25, 28, 30, 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Hoke in view of Schneider and further in view of Sun et al (hereinafter Sun), U.S Patent No. 6704282 which is included in the IDS.

13. As to claim 23, Hoke discloses a method for communicating on a network between a first data processing system and a second data processing system, the method comprising the computer implemented steps of:

transmitting data packets on the network from the first data processing system to the second data processing system using a virtual private network (VPN) (column 8, lines 38-48; column 9, 10-12);

automatically reconfiguring the VPN to use alternate addresses on the network for the first data processing system and the second data processing system (column 13, lines 28-49).

Hoke does not disclose activating one of a plurality of reconfiguring algorithms based on information from one or more avoider algorithm modules indicating when to switch between VPN tunnels; and

switch to an alternate VPN tunnel.

However, Schneider discloses activating one of a plurality of reconfiguring algorithms based on information from one or more avoider algorithm modules (column 19, lines 37-42).

Hoke and Schneider do not disclose indicating when to switch between VPN tunnels and switch to an alternate VPN tunnel.

However Sun discloses indicating when to switch between VPN tunnels and switch to an alternate VPN tunnel (column 4, lines 23-31).

It would have been obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Hoke, Schneider with the teaching of Sun to have a feature of activating one of a plurality of reconfiguring algorithms based on information from one or more avoider algorithm modules indicating when to switch between VPN tunnels and automatically reconfiguring the VPN to use alternate addresses on the network for the first data processing system and the second data processing system to thereby switch to an alternate VPN tunnel. Because it would provide users a better way of traffic loading, resource availability, reliability and scalability.

14. As to claim 25, Hoke, Schneider and Sun disclose the invention as described in claim 23 above. Sun discloses the information from one or more avoider algorithm modules indicating when to switch between VPN tunnels (column 4, lines 23-31). Sun does not disclose includes information indicating a specified time period a current VPN tunnel may be active. However, Hoke discloses includes information indicating a specified time period a current VPN tunnel may be active (column 12, lines 36-41).

It would have been obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Sun with the teaching of Hoke to have the information from one or more avoider algorithm modules indicating when to switch between VPN tunnels includes information indicating a specified time period a current VPN tunnel may be active. Because it would provide users a better way to free the

network bandwidth, minimize the cost of leasing lines and protect data from preventing intruder accessing VPN.

15. As to claim 28, Hoke discloses a distributed data processing system for communicating on a network, the distributed data processing system comprising:

transmitting means (Fig.2, Processor 600) for transmitting data packets on the network from a first data processing system to a second data processing system using a virtual private network (VPN) (column 8, lines 38-48; column 9, lines 10-12);

reconfiguring means (Fig.2, Packet Processing Module 618) for automatically reconfiguring the VPN to use alternate addresses on the network for the first data processing system and the second data processing system to thereby switch to an alternate VPN tunnel (column 13, lines 38-49).

Hoke does not disclose means for activating one of a plurality of reconfiguring algorithms based on information from one or more avoider algorithm modules indicating when to switch between VPN tunnels. However Schneider discloses means for activating (Fig.2, Access Filter 203) one of a plurality of reconfiguring algorithms based on information from one or more avoider algorithm modules (column 19, lines 37-42).

Hoke and Schneider do not disclose indicating when to switch between VPN tunnels. However Sun discloses indicating when to switch between VPN tunnels (column 4, lines 23-31).

The motivation of this claim is as same as the one of claim 23 above.

16. As to claim 30, Hoke, Schneider and Sun disclose the invention as described in claim 28 above. Sun discloses the information from one or more avoider algorithm modules indicating when to switch between VPN tunnels (column 4, lines 23-31). Sun does not disclose includes information indicating a specified time period a current VPN tunnel may be active. However Hoke discloses includes information indicating a specified time period a current VPN tunnel may be active (column 12, lines 36-41).

The motivation of this claim is as same as the one of claim 25 above.

17. As to claim 38, Hoke and Schneider disclose the invention as described in claim 21 above. Hoke discloses automatically selecting, during a same session between the first data processing system and the second data processing system (column 8 lines 38-48; column 9, lines 10- 12), wherein the alternate address assigned to the first data processing system and the alternate address assigned to the second data processing system are associated with the alternate VPN tunnel (column 12, lines 32-36; column 13, lines 28-49). Hoke does not disclose an alternate VPN tunnel for transmitting data packets from the first data processing system to the second data processing system. However Sun discloses an alternate VPN tunnel for transmitting data packets from the first data processing system to the second data processing system (column 4, lines 23-31).

The motivation of this claim is as same as the one of claim 23 above.

18. As to claim 39, Hoke, Schneider and Sun disclose the invention as described in claim 23 above. Hoke discloses the reconfiguring algorithms automatically select, during a same session between the first data processing system and the second data processing system (column 8, lines 38-48; column 9, lines 10-12), wherein the alternate address assigned to the first data processing system and the alternate address assigned to the second data processing system are associated with the alternate VPN tunnel (column 12, lines 32-36; column 13, lines 28-49). Hoke does not disclose the alternate VPN tunnel for transmitting data packets from the first data processing system to the second data processing system. However Sun discloses the alternate VPN tunnel for transmitting data packets from the first data processing system to the second data processing system (column 4, lines 23-31).

The motivation of this claim is as same as the one of claim 23 above.

19. As to claim 40, Hoke and Schneider disclose the invention as described in claim 26 above. Hoke discloses the reconfiguring algorithms automatically select, during a same session between the first data processing system and the second data processing system (column 8, lines 38-48; column 9, lines 10-12), wherein the alternate address assigned to the first data processing system and the alternate address assigned to the second data processing system are associated with he alternate VPN tunnel (column 12, lines 32-36; column 13, lines 28-49). Hoke does not disclose an alternate VPN tunnel for transmitting data packets from the first data processing system to the second data processing system. However Sun discloses an alternate VPN tunnel for

transmitting data packets from the first data processing system to the second data processing system (column 4, lines 23-31).

The motivation of this claim is as same as the one of claim 23 above.

20. As to claim 41, Hoke, Schneider and Sun disclose the invention as described in claim 28 above. Hoke discloses the reconfiguring algorithms automatically select, during a same session between the first data processing system and the second data processing system (column 8, lines 38-48; column 9, lines 10-12), wherein the alternate address assigned to the first data processing system and the alternate address assigned to the second data processing system are associated with the alternate VPN tunnel (column 12, lines 32-36; column 13, lines 28-49). Hoke does not disclose the alternate VPN tunnel for transmitting data packets from the first data processing system to the second data processing system. However Sun discloses the alternate VPN tunnel for transmitting data packets from the first data processing system to the second data processing system (column 4, lines 23-31).

The motivation of this claim is as same as the one of claim 23 above.

21. Claims 24, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Hoke in view of Schneider further in view of Sun as applied in claims 23 and 28 above and further in view of Ma et al (hereinafter Ma), U.S Patent No. 5953338.

22. As to claim 24, Hoke, Schneider and Sun disclose the invention as described in claim 23 above, Sun discloses the information from one or more avoider algorithm modules indicating when to switch between VPN tunnels includes information indicating that VPN tunnels should be switched (column 4, lines 23-31). Sun does not disclose based on a maximum number of data packets that may be sent over a currently active VPN tunnel. However Ma discloses based on a maximum number of data packets that may be sent over a currently active VPN tunnel (column 8, lines 16-30).

It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of Hoke, Schneider and Sun with the teaching of Ma to have the information form one or more avoider algorithm modules indicating when to switch between VPN tunnels includes information indicating that VPN tunnels should be switched based on a maximum number of data packets that may be sent over a currently active VPN tunnel. Because it would provide users the efficient way to prevent overload when transmitting data by applying load balancing function to manage the bandwidth of the system.

23. As to claim 29, Hoke, Schneider and Sun disclose the invention as described in claim 28 above. Sun discloses the information from one or more avoider algorithm modules indicating when to switch between VPN tunnels (column 4, lines 23-31). Sun does not disclose includes information indicating that VPN tunnels should be switched based on a maximum number of data packets that may be sent over a currently active VPN tunnel. However, Ma discloses includes information indicating that VPN tunnels

should be switched based on a maximum number of data packets that may be sent over a currently active VPN tunnel (column 8, lines 16-30).

The motivation of this claim is as same as the one of claim 24 above.

24. Claims 32, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoke, Schneider and Sun as applied to claim 23 above, further in view of Tunnicliffe et al (hereinafter Tunnicliffe), U.S Patent No. 6272110.

25. As to claim 32, Hoke, Schneider and Sun disclose the invention as described in claim 23 above. Sun discloses the one or more avoider algorithm modules determines when to switch between VPN tunnels (column 4, lines 23-31). Sun does not disclose based on an amount of data traffic transmitted over a current VPN tunnel. However Tunnicliffe discloses based on an amount of data traffic transmitted over a current VPN tunnel (column 3, lines 30-36).

It would have been obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Hoke, Schneider and Sun with the teaching of Tunnicliffe to have the one or more avoider algorithm modules determines when to switch between VPN tunnels based on an amount of data traffic transmitted over a current VPN tunnel. Because it would provide users the better way to balance the packets, save cost of leasing line and protect the content of data over VPN.

26. As to claim 33, Hoke, Schneider and Sun disclose the invention as described in claim 23 above. Sun discloses the current VPN tunnel is deactivated and the alternate VPN tunnel is activated (column 5, lines 53-60). Sun does not disclose the one or more avoider algorithm modules determine whether a current total amount of data traffic transmitted over a current VPN tunnel during a life of the current VPN tunnel is equal to or greater than a threshold amount of data traffic, and if the current total amount of data traffic transmitted over the current VPN tunnel is equal to or greater than the threshold. However Tunnicliffe discloses the one or more avoider algorithm modules determine whether a current total amount of data traffic transmitted over a current VPN tunnel during a life of the current VPN tunnel is equal to or greater than a threshold amount of data traffic, and if the current total amount of data traffic transmitted over the current VPN tunnel is equal to or greater than the threshold (column 3, lines 36-41).

The motivation of this claim is as same as the one of claim 32 above.

27. Claims 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoke, Schneider, Sun and Tunnicliffe as applied to claims 23 and 33 above, in view of Narad et al (hereinafter Narad), U.S Patent No. 6421730 and further in view of Patrik Larsson (hereinafter Larsson), U.S Patent No. 6163184.

28. As to claim 34, Hoke, Schneider, Sun and Tunnicliffe disclose the invention as described in claim 23 and 33 above. They do not disclose the threshold amount of data traffic is calculated as a sum of a portion of an IP address of the first data processing

system and a portion of an IP address of the second data processing system, multiplied by a constant. However Narad discloses the threshold amount of data traffic is calculated as a sum of a portion of an IP address of the first data processing system and a portion of an IP address of the second data processing system (column 92, lines 40-44). Narad does not disclose multiplied by a constant. However Larsson discloses multiplied by a constant (column 5, lines 40-41).

It would have obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Hoke, Schneider, Sun, Tunnicliffe and Narad with the teaching of Larsson to have the threshold amount of data traffic calculated as a sum of a portion of an IP address of the first data processing system and a portion of an IP address of the second data processing system, multiplied by a constant. Because it would provide users the better secured method to protect data over VPN.

29. Claims 35, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Hoke in view of Schneider, Sun and further in view of Pegrum et al (hereinafter Pegrum), U.S Patent No. 651417.

30. As to claim 35, Hoke, Schneider and Sun disclose the invention as described in claims 23 and 25 above. They do not disclose the specified time period that the current VPN tunnel may be active is determined based on a time at which the current VPN tunnel was activated. However Pegrum discloses the specified time period that the

current VPN tunnel may be active is determined based on a time at which the current VPN tunnel was activated (column 4, lines 10-13).

It would have been obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Hoke, Schneider, and Sun with the teaching of Pegrum to have the specified time period that the current VPN tunnel may be active is determined based on a time at which the current VPN tunnel was activated. Because it would provide user a better way to send, protect data over VPN.

31. As to claim 36, Hoke, Schneider and Sun disclose the invention as described in claims 23 and 25 above. They do not disclose the specified time period that the current VPN tunnel may be active is determined randomly. However Pegrum discloses the specified time period that the current VPN tunnel may be active is determined randomly (column 4, lines 10-13).

The motivation of this claim is as same as the one of claim 35 above.

32. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Hoke in view of Schneider, Sun and further in view of Laiho et al (hereinafter Laiho), U.S Patent No. 6151507.

33. As to claim 37, Hoke, Schneider and Sun disclose the invention as described in claims 23 and 25 above. They do not disclose the specified time period that the current VPN tunnel may be active is determined as a function of a sum of a number of minutes

past an hour at which the current VPN tunnel was activated plus a constant. However Laiho discloses the specified time period that the current VPN tunnel may be active is determined as a function of a sum of a number of minutes past an hour at which the current VPN tunnel was activated plus a constant (column 23, lines 46-59).

It would have been obvious to the one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Hoke, Schneider and Sun with the teaching of Laiho to have the specified time period that the current VPN tunnel may be active determined as a function of a sum of a number of minutes past an hour at which the current VPN tunnel was activated plus a constant. Because it would provide users the better way to select the validity period of VPN, also efficiently manage the VPN based on the period of time in which VPN is established.

Conclusion

34. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Muniyappa et al	U.S 6092200
Quentin c. Liu	U.S 6079020
Arrow et at	U.S 6226751

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BANGLONG TRAN whose telephone number is (571)270-3931. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m.-5:00p.m, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2458

/Joseph E. Avellino/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2446